

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-76 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, 27, 37, 41, 47, 57, 59, 65 and 75 are amended. The amendments to the Claims are fully supported by the Claims and Detailed Description as filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for courtesy extended during the interview on November 19, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that as amended, the claims distinguish over the prior art of record subject to further consideration and/or search.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 59-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended Claim 59 merely to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101. The amendment to Claim 59 is fully supported by the Claims and Detailed Description as filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-16, 18-26, 29, 31-36, 38-46, 49, 51-56 and 58-64, 67, 69-74, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ambe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,317). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to amended Claim 1, Ambe does not show, teach or suggest at least a data-link layer switch controller to request generation of an entry in a bridge table based on an IP multicast destination address and an IP source address. The data-link layer switch controller selects one or more of a plurality of ports based upon the entry. The amendments to Claim 1 are fully supported by the Claims and Detailed Description as filed, e.g., Paragraphs [0015] and [0022] of the Detailed Description.

As best understood by Applicant, Ambe includes a typical IP multicast table that includes IP multicast addresses. Resolution and forwarding of packets of Ambe are conducted through the IP multicast table. Ambe does not include a bridge table that includes IP multicast data. Bridge tables include data that is used by network bridges to connect multiple network segments at the data link layer (layer 2) of the OSI model. In other words, bridge tables include MAC address information and not IP multicast address information. Ambe also does not include a controller that requests generation of entries in a table. In contrast, Claim 1 includes a controller that requests generation of an entry in a bridge table based on IP multicast destination addresses and IP source addresses. Claim 1 therefore includes elements not found, shown, taught or suggested by Ambe.

Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 21, 41 and 59 are allowable for at least similar reasons as Claim 1. Claims 2-6, 8-16, 18-20, 22-26, 27-36, 38-40, 42-46, 48-56, 58 60-64, 66-74 and 76 ultimately depend from Claims 1, 21, 41 and 59 and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 65 and 75 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and without conceding the issue of patentability, Applicant has amended claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 65 and 75 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, 57, 65 and 75 should now be in condition for allowance.


## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 26, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/JHP